## 

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 DAVID BACK, NO. CIV. S-04-5 LKK/CMK 12 Plaintiff, 13 v. ORDER 14 ALLSTATE INSURANCE COMPANY, 15 INC., Defendant. 16 17 18 Defendant moves to exclude recovery of the excess judgment. 19 It acknowledges, however, that under the court's previous order 20 relative to a failure to investigate, plaintiff may obtain a 21 judgment which includes damages up to the policy limits plus 22 defense costs (asserted to be zero), and extra-contractual damages, 23 i.e. emotional distress and punitive damages arising out of the 24 | failure to investigate. The court agrees with defendant's 25 contention and its concession.

////

26

## Case 2:04-cv-00005-LKK-CMK Document 79 Filed 09/01/05 Page 2 of 2

Regarding the duty to settle, plaintiff takes issue with the
court's conclusion, citing and raising for the first time, Allen
v. Allstate Insurance Co., 655 F.2d 487, 490 (9th Cir. 1981).
While plaintiff's counsel's conduct may be viewed as an untimely
motion to reconsider, the court has no desire to commit error
because it refused to take up plaintiff's contention. Accordingly,
the court ORDERS as follows:
1. Defendant's motion to preclude recovery of the excess

- 1. Defendant's motion to preclude recovery of the excess judgment is GRANTED;
- 2. The hearing, currently set for September 26, 2005, is VACATED;
- 3. Defendant shall respond to plaintiff's contention relative to <u>Allen</u>, <u>supra</u>, within ten days; and
- 4. Thereafter, plaintiff's argument, construed as a motion to reconsider, will stand submitted.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: September 1, 2005.

/s/Lawrence K. Karlton
LAWRENCE K. KARLTON
SENIOR JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT